



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,012	12/31/2003	Suresh Rajgopal	03-LJ-017	9337
7590 Lisa K. Jorgenson, Esq. STMicroelectronics, Inc. 1310 Electronics Drive Carrollton, TX 75006			EXAMINER ZHU, BO HUI ALVIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2465	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/24/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/750,012	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAJGOPAL ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b> BO HUI A. ZHU	<b>Art Unit</b> 2465

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-22.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Jayanti K. Patel/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2465

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant requests that the finality of the Official Action mailed August 17, 2009 be withdrawn because examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that was not necessitated by amendment of the claims (Remark, page 8). Specifically, Applicant contends that the combination of Hariguchi, Delaney and Tal has never been previously cited as a basis for rejecting any claim. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Hariguchi, Delaney and Tal was cited as a basis for rejecting claims 4 and 17 in the Official Action mailed December 24, 2008 (see page 8). Thus, the rejections based on the combination of Hariguchi, Delaney and Tal are not new ground of rejections.

Regarding claims 1 and 10, applicant contends that the cited references do not teach the feature that each hash table is allocated a group of the memory blocks based on a size of the respective hash table (Remarks, page 9). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Delaney discloses "The size of this has-table is preferably limited in order to reduce memory consumption." (see paragraph [0043]).

Regarding claims 2 and 15, applicant contends that the cited references do not teach that each hash table is allocated a smallest number of memory blocks sufficient to hold prefixes for which no collision occurs within the respective hash table (Remarks, page 10). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hariguchi discloses each hash table is allocated memory space to hold prefixes for which no collision occurs within the hash table (see column 6, lines 31 - 39; column 9, lines 12 - 15). Delaney discloses a hash table is allocated a smallest number of memory space sufficient to hold entries within the hash table (see paragraph [0043]). The combination of Hariguchi and Delaney discloses each hash table is allocated a smallest number of memory blocks sufficient to hold prefixes for which no collision occurs within the respective hash table.

Regarding claims 3, 12 and 16, applicant contends that the cited references do not disclose that the variable number of memory blocks allocated to a hash table is limited to a predetermined number (Remarks, page 11). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Delaney discloses the size of a hash table is limited to reduce memory consumption (see paragraph [0043]).

Regarding claims 5 and 18, applicant contends that the cited references do not disclose that at least one hash table comprises a plurality of hash tables, each hash table containing different length prefixes (Remarks, page 11). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hariguchi discloses each hash circuit 82 is associated with one unique prefix length (see column 5, line 20 - 31).